turned with the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act and who argued that they were responsible for its approval, and that the Tydings-McDuffie Law with one slight amendment was identical? Should the *Antis* who returned with the Tydings-McDuffie Law and who argued that they were responsible for vital amendments of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act and had made possible further concessions? Only a Solomon could decide. As no Solomon is available, let us concede that both sides were actuated by pure patriotism.

I may be pardoned if I tell of incidents which go to prove my thesis. I was in Manila when Congressman Hare, one of the authors of the Independence Law, made a trip to the Philippines. On the morning of the day when the Congressman was to leave the Islands, I was called to the residence of President Quezon for an unrevealed purpose. The President of the Senate was in his dressing gown, and anyone could readily see that he was a sick man and much perturbed. He handed me a copy of the proposed bill, with which I was not familiar, and went on with a conference with Rafael Alunan, the Secretary of Finance. That concluded, he called his stenographer and attempted to dictate a letter to Congressman Hare setting forth objections to the bill. As his hoarseness made it difficult for him to proceed, whenever I could grasp his idea I dictated for him to the stenographer and occasionally interpolated ideas of my own. Remember that at that time the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Bill was not a law and that opposition to it had not crystalized, and you will believe as I did

that the President of the Senate was actuated by sincere convictions in expressing himself on the bill. I do not think that as Mr. Quezon dictated that letter he had in mind a Machiavellian scheme whereby he could rout his adversaries and could claim for himself exclusive credit for obtaining independence for his country. That at least was my impression after being with him for close to three hours as he thought out loud in dissecting the independence bill.